

**Notes: Floodplain Task Force Meeting
August 20, 2002**

**POLICIES PERTAINING TO STREET AND ALLEY VACATIONS AND
SURPLUS LAND IN THE FLOOD PLAIN-SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS.**

The members of the F.P.T.F. broke into two groups.

The Mayor's F.P.T.F. needs to consider policy recommendations for proposed street and alley vacations and surplus land within the flood plain.

Street and Alley Vacations

City-owned property in the floodplain.

Property owner abutting a street or alley proposes to vacate it (typically for building, parking areas, or private drives).

Current policy is:

1. The City retains a conservation easement that protects the flood storage capacity (the area cannot be filled or built upon, except for open space uses like a parking lot that preserve the flood storage);

OR

2. The applicant may propose to deed a new conservation easement over a nearby area, which would provide the same storage capacity (e.g. 500 cubic yards of fill dirt and building volume is compensated by the protection of 500 cubic yards of open flood storage volume elsewhere).

General Comments from Reggi's Group:

- Blanket policy is not workable
- Option two is not a right.
- Policy should reflect what our goals for the area are
- Need to have a differentiated/two set policy. One for old neighborhoods and one for new development.
- Need to present alternatives to potential users.
- Haymarket and Antelope Valley areas would be hard by possible new policy.
- The Policy needs to be directed towards the area. Development in established areas is different from development in un-established areas.
- Parking is always the big problem.
- Need to look at the cost benefit of replacing.
- What is the County's role?

Consideration for the ability to provide storage in another location (option 2, above) should take into account the following:

- 1. Does allowing the conservation easement in an alternate area encourage further development in the flood plain that would not otherwise occur due to space limitations?**

Comments:

- Does, not a bad thing.
- Goes back to mapping.
- Need a high standard with cost-benefit analysis.

- 2. These applications are typically in the older, developed areas of Lincoln, where existing businesses may have a need to expand. Should these areas be treated differently than new development on the fringe of the City?**

Comments:

- Yes.
- Sub-Area planning must take vacated area into account, especially in older neighborhoods.

- 3. Acquisition of new easement takes greater processing time/resources. Proposed new conservation easements must be found to be in conformance with the Comp Plan, and then an easement agreement must be developed and accepted by resolution of the City Council.**

Comments:

- Need a pre-planning model.
- Sub-area planning first will mitigate less time that is necessary
- Could be very localized (in reference to the article in the newsletter that was given out at the beginning of the meeting)

Nicole Fleck-Tooze Small Group Discussion (Flip Chart):

- Different policy for older areas may be appropriate
- “Moot Point” if we adopt No Adverse Impact standard
- For businesses the current policy is generally fair
- Needs to be easy to understand and implement
- May need to solve larger Floodplain question first

- Need to consider flood-proofing options – is this feasible? Does it truly provide protection?
- One alternative: Don't sell
- Need to look at cost/benefit that includes loss of flood storage
- May be needed for additional flood storage
- Difficult to determine impacts when Floodplain may change
- Protecting flood storage should be priority
- Other communities are doing Floodplain buyouts
- Need review process with established criteria
- No loss of storage – might make acceptable.